

REMARKS

Prior to the present response, claims 1 to 3 were pending. By way of the present reply, Applicants have amended claims 1 to 3 solely for purposes of formality, and new claims 4 to 11 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-11 currently are pending. Support for the new claims is found, for example, at least in pages 3 to 4 of the specification, in Figures 6 and 7, and in the last paragraph of page 13 to the end of page 16. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks:

The 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) on the basis of the Stinebruner patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,910). This rejection is respectfully traversed, as the Stinebruner patent fails to describe each and every feature set forth in pending independent claim 1, and thus also in dependent claim 2. Patentable differences between the claimed subject matter and the Stinebruner patent are explained below.

Independent claim 1 recites a video information distribution device that distributes and outputs video information including dynamic image video information and processed digital static image video information, and an image control signal. In connection with these claimed features, the Office alleges, at section 2 on page 2, that the Stinebruner patent describes "a video information distribution device," and refers to the video sources 5 shown in Figure 1 (i.e., Video Sources 1 to n), and column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 1. The Office further alleges that the claimed feature of "an image control signal" output from the video information distribution device is disclosed by the controller 12 described in column 5, lines 56-63 of the

Stinebruner patent. Stinebruner describes outputting a control signal from the controller 12 to, among other things, a source selector that outputs one signal from the tuners 22 (i.e., Tuner 1 to n receiving video from a respective video source 5) (also see, column 6, lines 49-51). From this portion of the Office Action, therefore, it appears that the Office is interpreting the controller 12 to be a part of the structure that allegedly corresponds to the claimed video information distribution device.

The Office Action then goes on to assert that the Stinebruner patent discloses the claimed video information receiving and display device, which it characterizes as "see Fig. 1, video system 10 excluding the video sources". From this passage, it is unclear how the disclosure of the Stinebruner patent is being interpreted relative to the claim recitations. On one hand, as noted above, it appears that the controller 12 is considered to be part of the structure that is alleged to correspond to the video information distribution device, together with the video sources 5. On the other hand, by stating that the video information receiving and display device comprises all of the structure shown in Fig. 1 with the exception of the video sources, it appears that the controller is considered to be part of this latter claimed feature. If the rejection is not withdrawn, the examiner is requested to clarify the record, and explain whether the controller 12 is being interpreted to be a part of the video information and distribution device, or a part of the video information receiving and display device, so that Applicant can better understand and more fully address the basis for the rejection.

In any event, regardless of which interpretation is given, it is respectfully submitted that the Stinebruner patent does not disclose all of the features recited in claim 1. The claim recites that the video information distribution device outputs

processed digital static image video information and an image control signal, and that the video information receiving and display device "restores in advance a state before processing of processed digital static image video information of a next static image to be displayed, in accordance with an instruction of the image control signal, and stands by for next display." As one example described in the application, processed digital static image video information might be a compressed image. In this example, therefore, the restored state before processing is the non-compressed, i.e. expanded image. As recited in the claim, the restoration is carried out "in accordance with [the] instruction of the image control signal" output by the video information distribution device.

The Stinebruner patent does not mention anything about "processed digital static image video information." The Office appears to assert the disclosure of both dynamic and static image video information is implicitly described in Stinebruner, by stating that the system illustrated in Fig. 1 "includes the ability to broadcast individual processed digital ... still frames/images". Even if the system has the capability to *broadcast* still frames, such a fact by itself does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 1. The claim recites that the receiving end of the system operates to restore a next static image to its pre-processed state in accordance with an instruction of the image control signal. The Office alleges that this feature is disclosed in Stinebruner, at column 8, lines 53-67, which describes pre-tuning non-selected sources to anticipate future key depressions by a user, such as pre-tuning the next "up" channel if the user has depressed the up button.

However, this pre-tuning operation of Stinebruner does not function to restore processed static image video information to its pre-processed state. The pre-tuning

is not disclosed as having any relationship to the processing of received image data. Rather, it is an attempt to *anticipate* the user's next action. Whether or not the system is transmitting still images is totally irrelevant to this operation.

As set forth in MPEP § 2131 and the case law cited therein, a reference must show each and every feature of a claim for that reference to anticipate the claim. As pointed out above, the Stinebruner patent fails to disclose any relationship between signals sent by the controller 12 and the restoration of still image data to its pre-processed state, as recited in independent claim 1, and thus also incorporated in dependent claim 2. Accordingly, the rejection under Section 102(b) should be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Starting on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 3 is rejected as allegedly being obvious over Stinebruner in view of Potrebic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,824). However, it is respectfully submitted that the Potrebic et al. patent does not remedy the deficiencies pointed out above with respect to the Stinebruner patent, whether this patent is considered alone or in combination with Stinebruner.

The Office acknowledges that the Stinebruner patent fails to disclose the features of claim 3 relating to a video information distribution device that multiplexes the processed digital static image video information to the dynamic image video information and thus distributes and outputs the information, and a video information receiving and display device that demultiplexes the processed digital static image video information from the multiplexed dynamic image video information. Moreover, the Potrebic et al. patent does not remedy the shortcomings of Stinebruner with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, the cited portions of Potrebic et al. do not appear to

disclose the features recited in claim 3 related to multiplexing processed digital static image video information to the dynamic image video information.

Nor does the reasoning provided on pages 4 to 5 of the Action explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to modify Stinebruner in view of Potrebic. Stinebruner is directed to the selection of a video signal from among multiple sources, for transmission on virtual channels. There is no apparent reason to employ multiplexing in this context.

For at least these reasons, the Stinebruner and Potrebic et al. patents do not render obvious the claimed subject matter.

Finally, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 4 to 11 recite additional, separately patentable distinctions not rendered obvious by the applied documents. Because the distinctions pointed out above with respect to the independent claim 1 are submitted to be clear, and each of claims 4 to 10 depend from claim 1, a detailed explanation of each patentable distinction set forth in these new claims is believed to be unnecessary at this time. Claim 11 is submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejections under Sections 102 and 103, and allow pending claims 1 to 11.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that could be addressed by way of a telephonic or personal conference, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 17, 2009

By: /James A. LaBarre/
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620